



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,039	10/17/2003	James R. Crossgrove	END920030050US1	9190
45092 7590 06/24/2011 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE ST 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207				
EXAMINER ZIMMERMAN, MATTHEW E				
ART UNIT 3625		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/24/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/688,039

**Applicant(s)**

CROSSGROVE ET AL.

**Examiner**

MATTHEW ZIMMERMAN

**Art Unit**

3625

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/21/2011 has been entered.

### ***Status of Claims***

2. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22-23 have been examined.
3. Claims 6, 11, 21 have been cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 9, 16 have been amended.

### ***Examiner Comments***

5. In the prior and present Office actions the Examiner has twice rejected the claims and the rationale for such was stated in the response to arguments section in the action mailed on 08/04/2010. At present, the claims still stand twice rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the system-initiated request" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

**1<sup>st</sup> Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22-23**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-4, 7-8, 16-19, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton (US 2002/0055878) in view of Uchida (US 2005/0065859).**

Referring to claim 1, Burton teaches a system for maintaining item requests, comprising:

- at least one computer device (*see Burton Fig. 1-3*) comprising a system for detecting an error with an item request (*see Burton Fig 1 item 104 and ¶0456 lines 1-5, the web server system locates problematic orders for presentation to the user*);

Burton does not explicitly disclose where the request is a "system-imitated" request and "detected based upon a lack of locating a supplier or an approver". However, in an analogous art, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine these methods because it would lead to more revenue and save time and money. It would increase revenue by enabling the system to handle more orders (i.e., system-initiated requests) which increases revenue. It would also save time (which equates to money) by alerting the relevant individuals of a need to intervene in the ordering process due to a lack of supplier or approver as opposed to not doing anything and leaving the order in limbo.

The combination further teaches:

- a queue system for inserting any failed system-initiated requests into a failed request queue in response to detecting the error (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list memory*);
- a view presentation system for presenting an administrator with a view of the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);
- a data presentation system for displaying data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to user-initiated item requests to an administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the data presentation system accesses a set of tables to obtain the data (*see Burton ¶0456*), and wherein the set of tables includes a party table that identifies suppliers suggested by users

issuing the user-initiated item requests for fulfilling the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data including at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);

- o a data edit system for allowing the administrator to edit the data corresponding to the user-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*);
- o wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented separately to the administrator in separate views within a single window without opening multiple windows (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*).

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation “the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising “an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of “presenting a view” and the prior art of Burton and Uchida are capable of meeting this limitation In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), In re Lowry, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2016.01.

Referring to claim 2, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the set of tables further includes a header level text table that identifies business justifications set forth by the users for approving the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data further including at least one identified business

justification (*see Burton Fig. 81 and 86, an order – the Examiner notes that a business justification for an order is the order itself and Burton teaches a list of orders*).

Referring to claim 3, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing a request reception system for receiving the user-initiated item requests from the users (*see Burton ¶0133 line 4*) and the system-initiated item requests from at least one external system (*see Burton Fig. 2 items 112-113; ¶0124 lines 1-2*), wherein the request reception system further populates the set of tables using data from the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0268*).

Referring to claim 4, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing a request processing system for assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (*see Burton Fig. 62 "Confirm your order", "SUBMIT"*) and after the user approves the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (*see Burton Fig. 86*).

Referring to claim 7, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a global administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*).

Referring to claim 8, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the view presentation system further provides a country administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*) with the view of the failed request queue (*see Burton Figs.*

81, 86), and wherein the data presentation system further displays the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests to the country administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*).

Referring to claim 16, Burton teaches a program product stored on a non-transitory computer readable medium for maintaining item requests, which when executed comprises, comprising:

- program code for detecting an error in the request (*see Burton Fig 1 item 104 and ¶0456 lines 1-5, the web server system locates problematic orders for presentation to the user*);

Burton does not explicitly disclose where the request is a “system-initiated” request and “detected based upon a lack of locating a supplier or an approver”. However, in an analogous art, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these methods because it would lead to more revenue and save time and money. It would increase revenue by enabling the system to handle more orders (i.e., system-initiated requests) which increases revenue. It would also save time (which equates to money) by alerting the relevant individuals of a need to intervene in the ordering process due to a lack of supplier or approver as opposed to not doing anything and leaving the order in limbo.

The combination further teaches:



- program code for inserting any failed system-initiated item requests into a failed request queue in response to detecting the error (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list*);
- program code for presenting an administrator with a view of the failed request queue, the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);
- program code for displaying data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to user-initiated item requests to an administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the program code for displaying accesses a set of tables to obtain the data (*see Burton ¶0456*), and wherein the set of tables includes a party table that identifies suppliers suggested by users issuing the user-initiated item requests for fulfilling the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data including at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);
- program code for allowing the administrator to edit the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*);

- wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator in separate views within a single window without opening multiple browser (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*).

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation “the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising “an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of “presenting a view” and the prior art of Burton and Uchida are capable of meeting this limitation. *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994), MPEP 2016.01.

Referring to claim 17, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, wherein the set of tables further includes a header level text table that identifies business justifications set forth by the users for approving the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data further including at least one identified business justification (*see Burton Fig. 81 and 86, an order – the Examiner notes that a business justification for an order is the order itself and Burton teaches a list of orders*).

Referring to claim 18, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, further comprising program code for receiving the user-initiated item requests from the users (*see Burton ¶0133 line 4*) and the system-initiated item requests from at least one external system (*see Burton Fig. 2 items 112-113; ¶0124 lines 1-2*), wherein the program code further populates the set of tables using data from the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0268*).

Referring to claim 19, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, further comprising program code for processing the user-initiated requests and the system-initiated requests by assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (*see Burton Fig. 62 "Confirm your order", "SUBMIT"*) and after the user approves the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (*see Burton Fig. 86*).

Referring to claim 22, the combination discloses the the program product of claim 16, wherein the administrator is a global administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*).

Referring to claim 23, the combination discloses the the program product of claim 16, wherein the program code for presenting further provides a country administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*) with the view of the failed request queue (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), and wherein the program code for displaying further displays the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests to the country administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*).

9. **Claims 5, 9-10, 12-15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton (US 2002/0055878) and Uchida (US 2005/0065859) in further view of Joseph (US 6,606,603).**

Referring to claim 5, the combination discloses the system of claim 4, further disclosing wherein the processing system processes the system-initiated requests differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

Referring to claim 9, Burton teaches a computer-implemented method for maintaining item requests, executed on a computer device, the method comprising:

- receiving, on the computer device, a user-initiated item request (*see Burton ¶0133*), wherein the user-initiated item request identifies a supplier for fulfilling the user-initiated item request (*see Burton ¶0133 line 6*);

Burton does not explicitly disclose where the requests may also be system-initiated requests (i.e., receiving, in addition to a user-initiated request, a system-initiated request). However, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these methods because enabling the system maintaining item

requests to also handle system-initiated requests leads to the predictable result of handling more types of orders and increased revenue.

The combination further teaches:

- processing, on the computer device, the user-initiated item request and the system-initiated request (*see Burton Fig. 4 items 168, 170, 184*), wherein the system-initiated item request is processed differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*);
- inserting, on the computer device, the system-initiated item request into a failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list*);
- presenting, on the computer device, an administrator with a view of the failed request queue upon request, the view including an identification of a system-initiated request that failed and a reason for the failure (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);
- accessing, on the computer device, a set of tables to display data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to the system-initiated item request and user-initiated item request to the administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the set of tables accessed includes a party table that identifies the supplier, the displayed data including

at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);

- wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented separately to the administrator in separate views within a single window without opening multiple windows (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*).

The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation "the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising "an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of "presenting a view" and the prior art of Burton, Uchida, and Joseph are capable of meeting this limitation *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2016.01.

Referring to claim 10, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing a method for assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests

and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (*see Burton Fig. 62 "Confirm your order", "SUBMIT"*) and after the user *approves* the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (Fig. 86).

Referring to claim 12, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a global administrator (administrators having different permission levels) (*see Burton Fig. 103, ¶0494*).

Referring to claim 13, the combination discloses the method of claim 12, further disclosing providing the global administrator with the capability to edit displayed data (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*).

Referring to claim 14, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a country administrator (administrators having different permission levels) (*see Burton Fig. 103, ¶0494*).

Referring to claim 15, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the user-initiated item request further includes a business justification for approving the user-initiated item request (a business justification for an order is the order itself) (*see Burton ¶0102, lines 3-4*), and wherein the set of tables accessed to display the data further includes a header level text table (*see Burton Fig. 35, item 2016*).

Referring to claim 20, the combination discloses the program product of claim 19, further disclosing wherein the program code for processing processes the system-initiated requests differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user*

*selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22-23 (in the alternative)**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1-4, 7-8, 16-19, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton (US. Pub. No. 2002/0055878) in view of Uchida (US 2005/0065859) in further view of McFeely (US 2002/0184237).**

Referring to claim 1, Burton teaches a system for maintaining item requests, comprising:

- at least one computer device (*see Burton Fig. 1-3*) comprising a system for detecting an error with an item request (*see Burton Fig 1 item 104 and ¶0456 lines 1-5, the web server system locates problematic orders for presentation to the user*);



Burton does not explicitly disclose where the request is a "system-initiated" request and "detected based upon a lack of locating a supplier or an approver". However, in an analogous art, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these methods because it would lead to more revenue and save time and money. It would increase revenue by enabling the system to handle more orders (i.e., system-initiated requests) which increases revenue. It would also save time (which equates to money) by alerting the relevant individuals of a need to intervene in the ordering process due to a lack of supplier or approver as opposed to not doing anything and leaving the order in limbo.

The combination further teaches:

- a queue system for inserting any failed system-initiated requests into a failed request queue in response to detecting the error (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list memory*);
- a view presentation system for presenting an administrator with a view of the failed request queue, the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);

- a data presentation system for displaying data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to user-initiated item requests to an administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the data presentation system accesses a set of tables to obtain the data (*see Burton ¶0456*), and wherein the set of tables includes a party table that identifies suppliers suggested by users issuing the user-initiated item requests for fulfilling the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data including at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);
- a data edit system for allowing the administrator to edit the data corresponding to the user-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*);

The combination further teaches wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator in views within a single window without opening multiple windows (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the failed request queue and the data are presented separately in separate views. However, in an analogous art, McFeely teaches wherein the failed request queue and the data are presented separately in separate views (*see McFeely Figs. 3, 6, and ¶0062, the system displays the "alerts" portion separate from the other portions, wherein each portion is accessible in the same*

*browser window through separate tabs*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these references because it would increase efficiency and thus save money. Specifically, separating the failed request queue (alerts) from the other data will permit the administrator to quickly access the failed requests instead of sorting through the failed requests from non-failed requests.

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation "the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising "an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of "presenting a view" and the prior art of Burton and Uchida and McFeely are capable of meeting this limitation. *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2016.01.

Referring to claim 2, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the set of tables further includes a header level text table that identifies business justifications set forth by the users for approving the user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 81 and 86, an order – the Examiner notes that a business justification for an order is the order itself and Burton teaches a list of orders*).

Referring to claim 3, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing a request reception system for receiving the user-initiated item requests from the users (*see Burton ¶0133 line 4*) and the system-initiated item requests from at least one external system (*see Burton Fig. 2 items 112-113; ¶0124 lines 1-2*), wherein the

request reception system further populates the set of tables using data from the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0268*).

Referring to claim 4, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing a request processing system for assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, *Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (see Burton Fig. 62 "Confirm your order", "SUBMIT") and after the user approves the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (see Burton Fig. 86).*

Referring to claim 7, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a global administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*).

Referring to claim 8, the combination discloses the system of claim 1, further disclosing wherein the view presentation system further provides a country administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*) with the view of the failed request queue (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), and wherein the data presentation system further displays the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests to the country administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*).

Referring to claim 16, *Burton teaches a program product stored on a non-transitory computer readable medium for maintaining item requests, which when executed comprises, comprising:*

- program code for detecting an error in the request (*see Burton Fig 1 item 104 and ¶0456 lines 1-5, the web server system locates problematic orders for presentation to the user*);

Burton does not explicitly disclose where the request is a "system-initiated" request and "detected based upon a lack of locating a supplier or an approver". However, in an analogous art, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these methods because it would lead to more revenue and save time and money. It would increase revenue by enabling the system to handle more orders (i.e., system-initiated requests) which increases revenue. It would also save time (which equates to money) by alerting the relevant individuals of a need to intervene in the ordering process due to a lack of supplier or approver as opposed to not doing anything and leaving the order in limbo.

The combination further teaches:

- program code for inserting any failed system-initiated item requests into a failed request queue in response to detecting the error (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list*);
- program code for presenting an administrator with a view of the failed request queue, the view including an identification of a request that failed an a reason

- for the failure (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);
- program code for displaying data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to user-initiated item requests to an administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the program code for displaying accesses a set of tables to obtain the data (*see Burton ¶0456*), and wherein the set of tables includes a party table that identifies suppliers suggested by users issuing the user-initiated item requests for fulfilling the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data including at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);
  - program code for allowing the administrator to edit the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*);

The combination further teaches wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator in views within a single window without opening multiple windows (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the failed request queue and the data are presented separately in separate views. However, in an analogous art, McFeely teaches wherein the failed request queue and the data are presented separately in separate views (*see McFeely Figs. 3, 6, and ¶0062, the system displays the "alerts"*

*portion separate from the other portions, wherein each portion is accessible in the same browser window through separate tabs*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these references because it would increase efficiently. Specifically, separating the failed request queue (alerts) from the other data will permit the administrator to quickly access the failed requests instead of sorting through the failed requests from non-failed requests.

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation “the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising “an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure” does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of “presenting a view” and the prior art of Burton and Uchida and McFeely are capable of meeting this limitation. *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2016.01.

Referring to claim 17, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, wherein the set of tables further includes a header level text table that identifies business justifications set forth by the users for approving the user-initiated item requests, the displayed data further including at least one identified business justification (*see Burton Fig. 81 and 86, an order – the Examiner notes that a business justification for an order is the order itself and Burton teaches a list of orders*).

Referring to claim 18, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, further comprising program code for receiving the user-initiated item requests from the

users (*see Burton ¶0133 line 4*) and the system-initiated item requests from at least one external system (*see Burton Fig. 2 items 112-113; ¶0124 lines 1-2*), wherein the program code further populates the set of tables using data from the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests (*see Burton ¶0268*).

Referring to claim 19, the combination discloses the program product of claim 16, further comprising program code for processing the user-initiated requests and the system-initiated requests by assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (*see Burton Fig. 62 "Confirm your order", "SUBMIT"*) and after the user approves the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (*see Burton Fig. 86*).

Referring to claim 22, the combination discloses the the program product of claim 16, wherein the administrator is a global administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*).

Referring to claim 23, the combination discloses the the program product of claim 16, wherein the program code for presenting further provides a country administrator (*see Burton Fig. 103 and ¶0494, there are many administrators with many different permission levels*) with the view of the failed request queue (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), and wherein the program code for displaying further displays the data corresponding to the system-initiated item requests and the user-initiated item requests to the country administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*).



12. **Claims 5, 9-10, 12-15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burton (US. Pub. No. 2002/0055878) in view of Uchida (US 2005/0065859) in further view of Joseph (US 6,606,603) and in further view of McFeely (US 2002/0184237).**

Referring to claim 5, the combination discloses the system of claim 4, further disclosing wherein the processing system processes the system-initiated requests differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

Referring to claim 9, Burton teaches a method for maintaining item requests, comprising:

- receiving, on the computer device, a user-initiated item request (*see Burton ¶0133*), wherein the user-initiated item request identifies a supplier for fulfilling the user-initiated item request (*see Burton ¶0133 line 6*);

Burton does not explicitly disclose where the requests may also be system-initiated requests (i.e., receiving, in addition to a user-initiated request, a system-initiated request). However, Uchida does (*see Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26, the system generates an error signal and stores it in the memory if it cannot locate any retailers or dealers*

*having replacement toner bottles or cartridges in response to a request from the image forming device*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these methods because enabling the system maintaining item requests to also handle system-initiated requests leads to the predictable result of handling more types of orders and increased revenue.

The combination further teaches:

- processing, on the computer device, the user-initiated item request and the system-initiated request (*see Burton Fig. 4 items 168, 170, 184*), wherein the system-initiated item request is processed differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*);
- inserting, on the computer device, the system-initiated item request into a failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 81; ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20, orders that are problematic are inserted into an attention item list*);
- presenting, on the computer device, an administrator with a view of the failed request queue upon request, the view including an identification of a system-initiated request that failed and a reason for the failure (*see Burton Fig. 81, ¶0367, and ¶0456, the system displays the attention items 4112 to the user using HTTP and HTML*);
- accessing, on the computer device, a set of tables to display data, distinct from the failed request queue (*see Burton Fig. 86 and ¶0456, the system also displays attention items which are not problematic*), corresponding to the

system-initiated item request and user-initiated item request to the administrator (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86*), wherein the set of tables accessed includes a party table that identifies the supplier, the displayed data including at least one identified supplier (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86, the supplier is the restaurant selected by the user*);

The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

The Examiner finds that the descriptive material recited in the limitation "the view including an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" is non-functional and does not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The data comprising "an identification of a request that failed and a reason for the failure" does not in any way functionally affect the claimed steps of "presenting a view" and the prior art of Burton, Uchida, and Joseph are capable of meeting this limitation *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2016.01.

The combination further teaches wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator in views within a single window without opening multiple windows (*see Burton Figs. 81, 86; see ¶0456 lines 1-5, 17-20*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the failed request queue and the data are

presented separately in separate views. However, in an analogous art, McFeely teaches wherein the failed request queue and the data are presented separately in separate views (*see McFeely Figs. 3, 6, and ¶0062, the system displays the “alerts” portion separate from the other portions, wherein each portion is accessible in the same browser window through separate tabs*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these references because it would increase efficiently. Specifically, separating the failed request queue (alerts) from the other data will permit the administrator to quickly access the failed requests instead of sorting through the failed requests from non-failed requests.

Referring to claim 10, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing a method for assigning approvers (*see Burton Fig. 62*) and suppliers (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier restaurant*) to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. Regarding, assigning of approvers, Burton teaches a user approving a transaction (*see Burton Fig. 62 “Confirm your order”, “SUBMIT”*) and after the user *approves* the order the system assigns the user to the order via an order number (Fig. 86).

Referring to claim 12, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a global administrator (administrators having different permission levels) (*see Burton Fig. 103, ¶0494*).

Referring to claim 13, the combination discloses the method of claim 12, further disclosing providing the global administrator with the capability to edit displayed data (*see Burton ¶0138, lines 5-8*).

Referring to claim 14, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the administrator is a country administrator (administrators having different permission levels) (*see Burton Fig. 103, ¶0494*).

Referring to claim 15, the combination discloses the method of claim 9, further disclosing wherein the user-initiated item request further includes a business justification for approving the user-initiated item request (a business justification for an order is the order itself) (*see Burton ¶0102, lines 3-4*), and wherein the set of tables accessed to display the data further includes a header level text table (*see Burton Fig. 35, item 2016*).

Referring to claim 20, the combination discloses the program product of claim 19, further disclosing wherein the program code for processing processes the system-initiated requests differently from user-initiated item requests (*see Burton Fig. 36, a user selects a supplier [which is different from] Uchida ¶0026 lines 5-26 wherein the system selects a supplier*). The combination does not explicitly teach wherein the requests are processed in batch mode. However, in an analogous art, Joseph teaches wherein requests are processed in batch mode (*see Joseph Col. 7 lines 4-11*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to batch process the data because it would save processing time which would result in saving money.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, and 22-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW ZIMMERMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5278. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MATTHEW ZIMMERMAN/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3625